

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/977,052	11/25/97	ANDRIEU	X 048357

IM31/0426

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

MAPLES, J

ART UNIT  
1745

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/26/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Office Action Summary

Application No.  
08/977,052

Applicant(s)

AMRIEN ET AL

Examiner

JOHN S. MARLES

Group Art Unit

1745

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

### Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

### Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-12, 15, 18-21 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) 3, 13, 14, 16, 17 is/are objected to.

Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

### Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1745

1. Claims 7-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7-9 and 15 include improper Markush terminology and should be amended accordingly. Claims 10-12, dependent on claim 7, fall therewith.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dasgupta et al. (Dasgupta)

Reference is made to the Abstract of Dasgupta along with column 5, line 39 through column 6, line 32; column 8, line 63 through column 9, line 8 and Example 2.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1745

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dasgupta.

The only claimed features not shown by the patent to Dasgupta are the amount of the solvent and the polymer in the adhesive, the thickness of the adhesive and the porosity of the porous layers. The amounts of the solvent and polymer are deemed obvious design expedients to one of ordinary skill in this art because the same are well known. The same is true for the porosity of the layers-this is of no patentable moment. With regard to the thickness of the adhesive, Dasgupta teaches a thickness of the polymer laminate of around 0.1mm. Thus, the adhesive being around one-fifth of this amount would have been obvious especially in view of Figures 1a and 1b of Dasgupta and also with the well

Art Unit: 1745

known feature of adhesive being of a much smaller depth than the layers the adhesive is bonding.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Maples whose telephone number is (703) 308-1795. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 4:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Maria Nuzzolillo, can be reached on (703) 305-3776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3599.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

JSM/March 29, 1999

*John S. Maples*  
JOHN S. MAPLES  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1745